

**CITY PLANNING COMMISSION**  
**DESIGN ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**MINUTES– September 23, 2020**

**CPC ITEMS:**

1. **Consideration:** Minutes from 09/23/20
  
2. **Consideration: Zoning Docket 082/20** - Request by UJMK Realty LLC for a conditional use to permit drive-through facilities at a specialty restaurant in an MU-1 Medium Intensity Mixed-Use District, an HUC Historic Urban Corridor Use Restriction Overlay District, and an EC Enhancement Corridor Design Overlay District, on Square 403, Lots A, B, C, C, and D on a site with more than 100' feet of frontage in an EC Enhancement Corridor Design Overlay District. (SL)

The staff planner summarized the proposal. The applicant presented additional information regarding their application. The representative of the Department of Parks and Parkways (PPW) noted the following issues including that the turning radius of the drive-through lane needs to be modified, the Committee needs to see both ordering kiosks elevations, details of the front façade walk-up window, and the proposed streetscape. The representative of the Historic District Landmarks Commission (HDLC) made the following comments including that the pedestals of building need to go all the way to the parapet, the exterior lighting should be reconsidered, the quality and proportion of the gable on hip roof needs to be redesigned, and the design should either imitate a Shotgun style structure or a French Quarter style structure but not mix both together.

The representative of the **Department of Parks and Parkways** made a motion to **defer** the request to the October 7<sup>th</sup> 2020 DAC meeting, which was **seconded** by the representative of the **Capital Project Administration** and was **approved unanimously**.

3. **Reconsideration: Design Review 111/20 (reviewed by DAC on 7/8/20)** - Request by Imbrie Packard to construct a new retail development located within the EC Enhancement Corridor Overlay District with more than 100 feet of frontage. (TM)

The staff planner summarized the proposal. The applicant presented additional information regarding their application. The representative of the City Planning Commission (CPC) noted that there may be issues to accessing the proposed trash receptacle location. The representative of the Historic District Landmarks Commission (HDLC) suggested the cornices should be added to add elegance to the facade and the texture of the façade should vary to break up the monotony of the proposed design. The representative of the Department of Public Works (DPW) added that bike parking should be 2 feet off of the face of the curb.

The representative of the **HDLC** made a motion to **approve** the request subject to compliance with provided comments, which was **seconded** by the representative of the **Parks and Parkways** and was **approved unanimously**.

4. **Consideration:** Design Review 132/20 (previously considered under DR178-19) - This is a request for modification to DAC previously approved plans in a EC Enhancement Corridor on a site with more than 100' feet of frontage. (AN)

The staff planner summarized the request stating that the application has already come through the DAC for review in December 2019, but due to changes to the building's height to accommodate the (base flood elevation) BFE, the applicants are re-submitting for review. Changes to the site plan include a new ADA ramp and stairs at the front facade and along the parking area. The applicant presented additional information regarding their application.

The representative from Parks and Parkway (PPW) brought up issues with the existing driveway and curb cut and asked the applicant to modify this driveway to accommodate the existing live oak. The representative also brought up comments relating to the ADA ramps and requested the ADA parking space and ramp be re-designed. Representatives from Capital Project Administration (CPA) and Department of Public Works (DPW) also echoed these same issues with the existing ramps and the ADA parking space and requested the applicant re-work the site plan with City Planning Commission staff.

**Parks and Parkway** made a motion to **approve** subject to these changes, **DPW** **seconded** the motion and was **approved unanimously**.

5. **Consideration:** Design Review 133/20 - This is a request for new construction in HU-MU zoning district and EC Enhancement Corridor Design Overlay District on a site with over 100' feet of frontage. (VG)

The staff gave a brief description of the project and noted the following concerns pertaining to **Article 12, Table 12.3.A.1 (Table 12-2)** in that the applicant should revise the plans to clearly indicate the two separate suites on the first floor to show that each suite is 5000 sq.ft. or less and that the applicant should include the percentage of permeable open space on the plan; **Article 12, Section 12.3.B.1.e** and **Article 12, Section 12.3.B.1.g** showing the plans should be revised to show the ground floor containing a minimum transparency of fifty percent (50%) on the primary street and windows shall be constructed of transparent glass, the first floor of commercial buildings shall be designed with a minimum ceiling height of twelve (12) feet; **Article 20, Section 20.3.QQ.2** and **Article 20, Section 20.3.QQ.3** requiring any exterior exercise areas shall provide covered areas over a minimum of fifty percent (50%) of the total area to provide shelter against weather, showing fencing of exterior exercise areas and any animals boarding quarters, and that there seven (7) foot solid fence is required around all exterior exercise areas; **Article 22.4.A (Table 22-1)** which permits developments in the HU-MU District are eligible for a number or parking exemptions/reductions that includes counting on-street spaces and exempting the first 5,000 square feet of a development and that the only required parking at this site would be for the residential units and therefore this development is compliant; and **Article 24** with renderings submitted show two wall signs, one projecting sign and one monument sign, but however the applicant has not submitted sufficient documentation to determine compliance. The applicant then indicated he received an interpretation from S&P indicating the reception area only needed be twelve feet and further added that the entire ceiling is 12 feet, however in areas on the first floor that are outside of the reception area, the proposed ceilings would be furred down.)

The Department of Public Works (DPW) representative noted that the sidewalk should be level with the parking, the site plans didn't appear to match the other drawings, the aisle width for the vehicle parking spaces nearest Annunciation Street side needs to be 24 ft., and a revised parking plan has been requested. The City Planning Commission (CPC) Planning administrator noted the fence should be 3 feet in height and added to the site plan. The Historic District Landmarks Commission (HDLC) representative requested revised renderings better depicting the windows.

The motion was made to **defer** the case to the October 7th meeting to give the applicant an opportunity to make the necessary revisions to the drawings and was **approved unanimously**.

6. **Consideration:** Design Review 139/20 - Renovations to an existing structure within a HU-B1 district and in CPC overlay on a site with over 100' feet of frontage. (TM)

The staff planner summarized the proposal. The applicant presented additional information regarding their application. The representative of the Department of Parks and Parkways (PPW) noted that the oak tree near the proposed cafe will need to be pruned in order to expand the structure and an arborist report will be necessary. The representative of the Historic District Landmarks Commission (HDLC) added the cornices around proposed additions are very pronounced and should be constructed more in line with existing style. The representative of Capital Project Administration (CPA) advised that the style of the proposed additions should match existing style. The representative of the Department of Public Works (DPW) noted the curb cut at the intersection of Washinton and Prytania must be removed and parking revisions may have to be made for spaces that abut non-compliant drive aisles.

The representative of the **HDLC** made a motion to **approve** the request subject to compliance with provided comments, which was **seconded** by the representative of the **DPW** and was **approved unanimously**.

7. **Consideration:** Design Review 130/20 (previously reviewed by DAC on 9/2/20) - This is a request for an adaptive reuse of two existing structures into a family living center on a site within the EC overlay and on a site with greater than 40K sq. ft. of gross floor area. (EH)

Staff summarized the proposal, concerns raised at the previous DAC meeting, and the requests from DAC, which included the submittal of architectural elevations from the Tchoupitoulas Street side, a revised landscape/site plan that does not include the destruction of seven (7) trees, and photos of existing and proposed brick. The applicant presented a rendering from the Tchoupitoulas Street frontage of the site, a visual comparison of the existing and proposed bricks, and the windows. The landscape architect also addressed the concerns surrounding the impacts on existing trees by noting that they would remove the bioswales under those trees.

The **Parks and Parkways** representative made a motion for **approval** subject to approval of a landscape plan by Parks and Parkways. The **Arts Council** representative seconded the motion, which was **unanimously approved**.